

pendence and the restoration of the flag. In this case the commission were wise enough to pit interests of each nation against the other and the treaty of independence was the successful result of the mission. And it is doubtful if annexation could have resulted in the present instance but for the war with Spain, which made the acquisition of these islands a matter of expediency to the United States.

The restoration of the flag might again have been hoped for, through diplomacy, by pitting the great powers against each other, as in 1843, but for the new rule in diplomacy recognizing "spheres of influence." As Hawaii is within the sphere of influence of the United States no other power, under this rule, has a right to protest if the United States desires to gobble islands within her conceded sphere of influence. All hope of restoration must, therefore, be considered futile. But if the Washington Government and optimistic Americans who have recently come to our shores, believe the spirit of Hawaiian independence is dead they will be sadly mistaken. This spirit will find vent in the demand for home rule, and if they do not get it, the Hawaiian contingent, their supporters and American sympathizers, will become a very nasty thorn in the side of the administration, little as we are. It is not at all improbable that, when Americanism becomes aggressive and menaces local interest, as it surely will, the promoters of annexation will become the most ardent supporters of the Hawaiian cause.

As the time draws near for the assembling of Congress and the establishment for Hawaii of what is called here (either rightly or wrongly) organic law, it is pertinent to speculate upon our future political status. There are a few, pretending to be wise, who declare that Hawaii will only be given a colonial government; but these are pessimists, and are given little credence. All are expecting, and we will undoubtedly receive a territorial form of government. Senator Clark, who recently visited Hawaii, believes that Hawaii will be given the most liberal form of territorial government. Senator Clark was first in Congress as territorial delegate from Wyoming, and has been in the Senate ever since the territory was admitted as a State; he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and also of the Judiciary Committee. In this capacity it will be necessary for him to pass upon the bill to extend the United States laws to Hawaii, and also upon President McKinley's nomination of Federal Judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii. He has visited Hawaii twice for the purpose of investigating local conditions, that he may be able to judge intelligently of Hawaiian matters when they come before him; and, furthermore, Mr. McKinley has asked Senator Clark to report to him his impressions of Hawaii. Therefore Senator Clark's opinion concerning the future political status of Hawaii must be taken to be as nearly the correct estimate of the situation that can be had this early. He unequivocally declared it as his opinion that we would receive the most liberal territorial government and unrestricted electoral franchise for all native Hawaiians and whites of whatever nationality who are willing to take the oath of allegiance to the United States. As evidence of his sincere belief in this opinion, and of the future prosperity of Hawaii, he has contracted for the building of a three-story modern business block on the corner of Fort and Beretania streets, which is to cost upwards of \$50,000.

Will the Hawaiians be Democrats or Republicans? That depends entirely upon President McKinley. **Democrats or Republicans:** There are from 10,000 to 15,000 voters in this territory who have no party affiliations who can be manufactured into partisans on either side. To be sure it cannot make much difference now. But the day will come when the Territory of Hawaii will be a State of the Union. When that time comes it will make a great difference whether these are Republican or Democratic voters. It is highly probable that the native and Portuguese vote will remain more or less faithful to the party they begin to affiliate with. If Mr. McKinley gives them a governor they are satisfied with, they will be Republicans to a man. If not, they will go "agin" the party that stole their independence, then would not do them justice after peaceably submitting to American rule. Mr. McKinley does his party a great wrong if he fails to manufacture new voters.

The latest advices seem to indicate that war between England and the Transvaal is inevitable. The Boers have made a compact with the Orange Free State and

President Kruger has sent a very equivocal reply to Mr. Chamberlain's last note, still asking for arbitration, which has been refused by England. To meet the emergency England is transporting troops to South Africa to bring the army up to 50,000 men. With the exception of the Crimean war this is the largest force England has ever sent to war out of her own borders.

This is something of a compliment to the fighting qualities of the Boers and shows that the catastrophe of Majuba hill has not been forgotten. It is estimated that the Boers cannot put more than 18,000 men in the field, but it is felt that they cannot be conquered without an overwhelming force pitted against them. It is only a question of when England must in her own interest possess the Transvaal and the war of conquest might as well come now as at any other time. England is not making the mistake the United States did in the Philippines. She is sending enough men to make success sure.

It does seem unjust that a great nation like England should find it necessary to crush so small a nation as the Boer Republic. The Hawaiians can sympathize

with the Boers. Olive Schreiner (Mrs. Cartwright) makes an eloquent appeal for the little people as follows:

"Let England clearly understand what war in South Africa means. The largest empire the world has ever seen will hurl its full force against a small state and about 30,000 men, including lads of 16 and old men of 60, without a standing army or organized commissariat. The entire little people will have to resolve itself into an army of their wives and daughters, who will prepare the bread and meat the farmers will put in their saddle bags when they go to meet the enemy. Today the women of the Transvaal are demanding guns that they may take their part in the last stand.

"We may crush the little people with the aid of Aussralians and Canadians, since the British isles seem unable to crush them alone. We may take their land and lower the little flag of independence, so dear to the Boer, but we shall have placed a stain upon our own that centuries will not wash

out. Only the international speculator who, through persistent misrepresentations and by means of the press has wrought this evil, will gain and fill his already over-loaded pockets with South African gold."

Bernhardt's View of Hamlet's Madness.

Sarah Bernhardt does not believe that the melancholy Dane was mad; neither does she believe that he was fat, as is often alleged. During her impersonation of Hamlet at the Adelphi Theater (see *The Literary Digest*, July 8), an expression of opinion from her on these two vital points was obtained by the *London Chronicle*. The following is a part of the interview as given in that paper:

"Your idea of Hamlet, I take it, is that of a slender, willowy youth?"

"Because the original impersonator of Hamlet was a fat man, therefore the tradition has remained that the noble Dane was of stout proportions. Here again, according to my lights, is an absolute error. He was slender and supple of limb, a man of nerves and intellect, dramatic and passionate in temperament. His hesitations and perplexities are mostly assumed, for as an avenger he must act a part and appear not to feel the storm of rage and indignation that runs riot in his blood."

"Then, I exclaimed, 'you do not believe that Hamlet was really mad?'"

"Mad," said Sarah Bernhardt slowly, as she bent down and clasped her hands in her ruddy hair, and her voice was like that of one in a dream. "What could those who said he was mad be thinking of? He feigned madness to effect his purpose, and carry out his ends. Observe, too, how he was all things to all men. Boisterous and amusing in his frolics with Polonius; wicked with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern because he knew them to be evil. Terrible with the king. He suits his moods to his purpose. It is all clear as day! With Ophelia there is no feigning, he is always real with her." And here the cadence of Sarah's incomparable voice changes to the softest music. "No need to speak of love, or pity poor Ophelia. She is Hamlet himself with one tender spot in his seared heart for the beauty he bade depart to a nunnery lest she should turn him from the path of vengeance he has mapped out for his own."

"The great actress knows the secret power of things unsaid, which is more potent than the eloquence of speech."

"Hamlet's insanity would give the lie to the very keynote of his character," continues Mme. Bernhardt. "Remember, too, he was not an Englishman but a Dane. I have endeavored to make him what he was. Perhaps you will be very angry if I tell you that Shakespeare is not English! He belongs to the world. His genius was what genius ever is, universal—cosmopolitan! He spoke in words that have reached the farthest corner of the earth, and found an echo in every heart! So profoundly am I imbued with the religion of Shakespeare that I cut out much less of Hamlet than you do on the English stage."

"Did you consider it a venture to play Hamlet in London?"

"I did, and a very bold venture, too, for a Frenchwoman. But I was accorded a most generous and cordial reception."

"Can any man," I ventured to ask her, "quite grasp the inner nature of Hamlet?"

"Perhaps not," smiled Mme. Bernhardt. "There is so much that is feminine in it. True, it takes the brains of a man, and the intuitive, almost psychic, power of a woman to give a true rendering of it."—From the *Literary Digest*.